



# Hunger Doesn't Take A Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report 2007

**FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER**

July 2007

FRAC  
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 540  
Washington, DC 20009  
(202) 986-2200 / [www.frac.org](http://www.frac.org)



---

## About FRAC

The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition.

For more information about FRAC, or to sign up for FRAC's Weekly News Digest, visit [www.frac.org](http://www.frac.org). For information about out-of-school time programs, go to [http://www.frac.org/Out\\_Of\\_School\\_Time/index.html](http://www.frac.org/Out_Of_School_Time/index.html)

---

## Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Rachel Cooper with assistance from Crystal FitzSimons, Srinidhi Vijaykumar, Dominick Sfregola, Alexis Bylander and Lynn Parker.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2006-2007 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs:

S. Daniel Abraham  
America's Second Harvest – The Nation's Food Bank Network  
Anonymous  
The Atlantic Philanthropies  
Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation  
California Endowment  
Annie E. Casey Foundation  
Consumer Health Foundation  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America  
Food Marketing Institute  
General Mills Foundation  
Robert P. and Judith N. Goldberg Foundation  
Grocery Manufacturers Association

Jewish Youth Philanthropy Institute  
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation  
Kaiser Permanente  
Kraft Foods, Inc.  
Land O'Lakes Foundation  
MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger  
Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation  
The Moriah Fund  
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation  
National Dairy Council  
Nestlé USA  
New Directions Foundation  
David and Lucile Packard Foundation  
Presbyterian Hunger Program  
Prince Charitable Trusts  
Pritzker Early Childhood Foundation  
Public Welfare Foundation  
Sara Lee Foundation  
Share Our Strength  
Taste of the NFL  
Trellis Fund  
Unilever United States, Inc.  
UPS Foundation  
Weissberg Foundation



---

# Executive Summary

**H**unger pays no attention to the school calendar—children need access to healthy meals regardless of the month of the year. But when school lets out for the long summer recess, the free and reduced-price school meals that millions of low-income children depend upon every weekday end, and children and their parents must figure out how to fill this nutrition gap. One of the best answers is good nutrition at recreational, educational, mentoring and other summer programs for children. But, the two federal programs—the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)—that offer children from low-income families and neighborhoods the kind of nutritious meals and snacks in the summer that they receive during the school year are woefully underutilized.

The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) publishes this annual Summer Nutrition Status Report to document the current status of participation in both programs as well as to promote successful initiatives to increase participation.

## Key Findings for 2006

### Nationwide

- Nationally in July 2006 an average of 2.85 million children participated in the Summer Nutrition programs each day (i.e. the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program combined), ending a string of seven years of decline in the number of children participating in the programs.
- From July 2005 to July 2006 participation in Summer Nutrition grew by 0.2 percent.
- While the slight increase in participation in 2006 is a positive step, since 2000 participation in the Summer Nutrition programs has fallen 242,953 children a day, or 8 percent.
- In July 2006, 17.7 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2005-2006 school year, compared to 18.0 children in July 2005. In July 2000 the ratio of children served by the Summer Nutrition programs was 22.2.

### Simplified Summer Food Program

- Congress has created a “Simplified Summer Food Program” that reduces paperwork for sponsors and makes it easier for them to get full reimbursement. In 2006 the program was expanded to 26 states. Between July 2005 and July 2006, those 26 states combined posted a 3.2 percent increase in Summer Nutrition participation, compared to a 0.8 percent decrease for the other states.

### State Data

- The District of Columbia, New Mexico, California, Nevada and New York had the highest rates for Summer Nutrition participation by low-income children.
- Louisiana, Kansas, Alaska, Oklahoma and Mississippi had the lowest rates for Summer Nutrition participation by low-income children.
- In July 2006 if every state reached the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2005-2006 school year, an additional 3.6 million children would have been served each day, and the states would have collected an additional \$199 million in child nutrition funding.

### Summer Food Standards of Excellence

When summer food sites serve quality, child-friendly food, it attracts children to the program and makes them more likely to consistently participate. To identify and promote quality summer food sites, FRAC created its [Summer Food Standards of Excellence](#).

The Summer Food Standards of Excellence can be used to evaluate what worked and what did not, identify areas of improvement, and encourage sites to reach the next level of program excellence.

By evaluating summer food sites and holding them to high standards, FRAC's goal is to increase the quality of food served and the site environment so that participation increases and more hungry children receive healthy and nutritious meals when school is out. [http://www.frac.org/Out\\_Of\\_School\\_Time/Summer/foodservice.html](http://www.frac.org/Out_Of_School_Time/Summer/foodservice.html)

---

# Introduction

**F**or most children the end of school and the coming of summer means feeling carefree, but for many low-income children summer means more hunger and for their parents the summer holiday is a time of increased worry as their children lose access to the nutritious school breakfasts and lunches on which they rely. On an average day in the 2005-2006 school year, 7.7 million low-income children ate breakfast at school and 16.1 million ate lunch. But when school lets out for the long summer recess, most of those children and their parents must figure out how to fill this nutrition gap. Many food banks report that demand for emergency food spikes in the summer months as families struggle to provide for their children.

Unfortunately, despite the need, the two federal programs—the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)—that offer children from low-income families and neighborhoods the kind of nutritious meals and snacks in the summer that they would receive during the school year are woefully underutilized. In July 2006, the month when nearly every school in America was closed for the summer break, both programs combined (FRAC describes them together in this report as the Summer Nutrition programs), on average, only served lunch to 2.85 million children a day. This means that for every 100 low-income children who ate a school lunch during the regular 2005-2006 school year, only 17.7 children were fed through the Summer Nutrition programs.

Poor participation in the Summer Nutrition programs leaves millions of low-income children without a reliable source for a nutritious meal. If every state had met an attainable standard of serving 40 low-income children lunch during the summer for every 100 eating lunch during the regular school year, 3.6 million more needy children would have been served nationally and states would have collected nearly \$199 million in additional child nutrition funding last year.

The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) publishes this annual Summer Nutrition Status Report to document the current status of participation in both programs as well as to promote successful initiatives to increase participation. By comparing summer nutrition participation in the states as well as

nationally, by describing successful strategies for expansion, and by detailing the impact of on-going administrative simplification efforts, this report seeks to advance the important work of getting healthy summer meals to every needy child.

## The Summer Food Service Program

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides funding through a state agency in each state to reimburse eligible sponsors for meals and snacks served to children at summer programs. Sponsors are fiscal intermediary organizations that operate one or more sites where programs for children provide meals and snacks. Eligible SFSP sponsors can be:

1. public or private nonprofit school food authorities,
2. local governments,
3. National Youth Sports Programs, or
4. private nonprofit organizations.

The SFSP is operated at sites where at least half the children in the geographic area are eligible for free or reduced price school meals, or at sites in which at least 50 percent of the children participating in the program are determined eligible for free or reduced price school meals based on individual applications. Once the site is deemed eligible, all children (up to age 18) can eat SFSP meals and snacks for free.

Sites serving primarily migrant children and certain summer camps also can participate.

---

# Why Are the Summer Nutrition Programs Important?

**G**ood nutrition is a key ingredient in raising healthy children. For the parents of the 12.9 million American children (one in six) who live below the poverty line, ensuring three nutritious meals a day without the help of federal nutrition programs is very difficult and sometimes impossible. The end of the school-year and school nutrition programs can push struggling families over the edge into hunger.

## Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation

According to the Census Bureau and USDA, among households with children 15.6 percent (containing 12.4 million children) were food insecure in 2005 – meaning they faced a constant struggle against hunger. This challenge becomes more acute during the summer months when USDA research shows food insecurity rates increase for households with children, and the increase is greater for states with low Summer Nutrition participation.<sup>1</sup> The availability of the Summer Nutrition programs alleviates some of the financial and emotional stress faced by low-income families, and means that children will continue to have a source for nutritious meals at no charge.

## Summer Nutrition Supports Educational and Enrichment Programs

Providing good nutritious meals goes hand in hand with ensuring that children have constructive activities to keep them safe, engaged, and learning during the summer months. The Summer Nutrition programs support meals served at local summer education and enrichment programs, recreation centers, schools, YMCAs, Boys and Girls Clubs, parks, houses of worship and any other location at which children congregate for positive activities during the summer.

These meals draw children into programs that are critical for their development, health, and well-being, and offer supervised activities while their parents are working. With the funding support provided by the Summer Nutrition programs, these enrichment programs keep children actively engaged in learning, combating the learning loss that often occurs during the long summer break,

particularly for children not engaged in positive activities.

## Summer Nutrition Can Help Reduce Obesity

Despite the popular image that summer is a time when children run around outside and slim down, recent studies show that this is not the case. A national survey of 5 and 6 year olds, for example, found that typically children, and especially minority children and those already considered overweight, were more vulnerable to excessive weight gain over the summer than during the school year. Many children are less active during summer and also may be eating poorer quality meals than they would if they had access to safe recreational programs and the Summer Nutrition programs.

### The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) in the Summer

In the summer, USDA provides funding to state agencies—usually the state education department—to reimburse public schools, private nonprofit schools and residential child care institutions for serving nutritious breakfasts, lunches and snacks to children in summer school or year-round school. Meals are served free to children with family incomes below 130 percent of the federal poverty line, and at a substantially reduced price when income is between 130 and 185 percent of poverty. The program also provides a small reimbursement for all other students for administrative support of the meal program.

Schools could always use the Summer Food Service Program to serve children who are not in school over the summer, but the paperwork involved in operating an additional program deterred many schools. USDA now offers a “Seamless Summer Food Option,” through which schools can offer summer meals as if they were operating the Summer Food Service Program, but without the additional paperwork. In essence, the school simply continues its NSLP meal service into the summer but can serve students not in summer school. Schools are reimbursed at the NSLP free meal rates for all of their students, as opposed to the higher SFSP rates, if they take this option. These meals served are counted in the summer NSLP rather than as part of the SFSP. As long as the school remains the sponsor, it also can provide meals and snacks to children at non-school sites.

---

<sup>1</sup>Nord, Mark and Kathleen Romig. 2006. “Hunger in the Summer: Seasonal Food Insecurity and the National School Lunch and Summer Food Service Programs,” *Journal of Children and Poverty* 12(2): 141-158.

---

# Participation in Summer Nutrition

## National Participation

Nationally in July 2006 an average of 2.85 million children participated in the Summer Nutrition programs (the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program combined) each day, ending the long term decline in participation in the programs. After declining for the last seven years, from July 2005 to July 2006 participation in Summer Nutrition actually grew slightly, by 0.2 percent. While the small increase of 6,955 children is a positive accomplishment for the programs, overall the Summer Nutrition programs are still performing significantly below their 2000 level, when they reached nearly 3.1 million children. As a result of decreased outreach and a complicated and often inadequate reimbursement system, since 2000 participation in the Summer Nutrition programs has fallen 242,953 children a day, or 8 percent.

Because the number of low-income children who are receiving free and reduced-price lunch during the regular school year is an excellent indicator of the need for the Summer Nutrition programs, FRAC uses it as a benchmark to measure summer participation. While the total number of children participating in Summer Nutrition grew slightly in 2006, the number of children enrolled in the regular year school lunch program grew so much faster that the ratio of children receiving Summer Nutrition compared to those receiving free or reduced-price lunch in the regular school year lost ground in 2006. In July 2006, 17.7 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2005-2006 school year, compared to 18.0 children in July 2005.

### Supporting the Community

The Indianapolis Public School District (IPS) sponsors Summer Food for all schools in the area that are open during the summer. It serves approximately seven thousand lunches per day. IPS provides meals for churches and Boys & Girls Clubs, which also sponsor SFSP. The district works closely with the city to ensure no overlap of services, and helps new sponsors and sites obtain equipment for safe food handling, such as extra milk coolers.

## Participation in the States

While absolute participation in the Summer Nutrition programs grew nationally, 32 states posted increases, 18 showed a decrease, and one no change between July 2005 and July 2006 (see Table 1). Nine states achieved double digit increases in their Summer Nutrition participation. The top five states for growth in 2006 were Alaska, Connecticut, North Carolina, Maryland and Wyoming.

While the majority of states posted increases in participation, fully a third of the states showed a decline in the number of children in their Summer Nutrition program in 2006, with six states seeing double digit decreases. While Mississippi and Louisiana ranked in the bottom five states, along with Oklahoma, Missouri and Hawaii, it is likely that their poor showing was due to lingering disruptions to their infrastructure after Hurricane Katrina. The dramatic drop seen in Hawaii of 71.2 percent was due to the state switching to a year-round school schedule in 2006.

### Change in the Number of Children Participating in Summer Nutrition, 2005 to 2006

State	Percent Change
<b>Top 5 States</b>	
Alaska	22.3%
Connecticut	21.0%
North Carolina	15.7%
Maryland	15.0%
Wyoming	15.0%
<b>Bottom 5 States</b>	
Oklahoma	-15.8%
Mississippi	-26.3%
Louisiana	-26.8%
Missouri	-31.9%
Hawaii	-71.2%

Looking at the ratio of children participating in Summer Nutrition compared to the National School Lunch Program during the regular school year is the best way to see how successful a state is in reaching all of its children in need. The disparities among the states are dramatic.

Only 10 states managed to reach at least one quarter of their low-income children, with the District of Columbia far outpacing the other states at 86.2 children participating in Summer Nutrition in July 2006 for every 100 low-income children receiving lunch in the 2005-2006 school year. The next closest state was New Mexico at 36.5 children per 100, followed by California, Nevada and New York. New York was the only newcomer to the top five list.

Unfortunately, 11 states served less than one-tenth of their low-income children through their Summer Nutrition programs in 2006. For July 2006, Louisiana joined Kansas, Alaska, Oklahoma and Mississippi as the five worst performing states.

**Children in Summer Nutrition in 2006  
per 100 Children in Free & Reduced-Price  
School-Year National School Lunch  
Program 2005-2006**

<b>State</b>	<b>Ratio</b>
<b>Top 5 States</b>	
District of Columbia	86.2
New Mexico	36.5
California	32.1
Nevada	29.9
New York	29.1
<b>Bottom 5 States</b>	
Louisiana	7.3
Kansas	7.1
Alaska	7.0
Oklahoma	5.0
Mississippi	4.2

### Improving Meal Quality and Appeal

St. Louis County's SFSP operates in the area surrounding the metro region, and serves about seven hundred meals per day. Last year the county made improving its meal quality and appeal a high priority. It worked with the company that prepares its meals to get more variety in fruit offerings. It also was able to switch to using more low fat products. Healthy lunch offerings include: grilled chicken breast sandwiches, turkey and cheese sandwiches, fresh plums, peaches, and baby carrots.

The county will sponsor any site that is willing to host the program. This enables many smaller organizations that would be unable to become sponsors themselves to participate in SFSP.



---

# The Simplified Summer Food Program

A complicated and time-consuming reimbursement system that makes it hard to get the standard federal per meal reimbursement is one of the main factors that discourages sponsors from participating in the Summer Food Service Program. Congress responded by establishing the Simplified Summer Food Program. The program was begun as a pilot project in 2001 with the goal of increasing participation and easing paperwork in the states then reaching the fewest children through SFSP (compared to the school-year school lunch program). The first Simplified Summer Food Program states were often referred to as Lugar Pilot states because Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN) initiated the idea and the legislation in Congress. It began with 13 states, but over time Congress has added more. The program was permanently authorized in 2005 and now covers 26 states and Puerto Rico.

While simplification on its own will not completely solve the problem of low participation in the Summer Nutrition programs, as a whole the states that are a part of the Simplified Summer Food Program have seen substantial gains that out-distance the rest of the nation. Between July 2005 and July 2006, the 26 simplified states combined posted a 3.2 percent increase in Summer Nutrition participation, compared to a 0.8 percent decrease for the non-simplified states (see Table 1).

The original 13 states that launched the Simplified Summer Food Program in 2001 were chosen because they were among the worst performing states. Yet between July 2000 (the year before they entered the program) and July 2006, these states experienced an impressive 51.5 percent growth rate in their Summer Nutrition participation. By contrast, the 25 states (including the District of Columbia which never got into the program during those years) suffered a combined loss in their Summer Nutrition participation of 16.5 percent (see Table 7).

The seven states that began the Simplified Summer Food Program for the first time in 2006 are already showing positive growth. Between July 2005 and July 2006, this wave of states managed to increase their Summer Nutrition participation by 2.5 percent.

## The Simplified Summer Food Program

Currently 26 states and Puerto Rico participate in the Simplified Summer Food Program. The states and the year they entered the program are:

**2001:** Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, Wyoming, and Puerto Rico (which is not part of this report.)

**2005:** Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, and Oregon.

**2006:** Arizona, Maine, North Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

**How It Works:** The program eliminates traditional SFSP cost-based accounting that separates administrative and operating costs when calculating reimbursements to sponsors. The traditional approach often discourages sponsors from participating in SPSF as they risk losing money if their administrative costs exceed the cap (\$0.23 per lunch as of 2007), even if their total costs (food, labor and administrative expenses) fall below the maximum reimbursement of \$2.87 per lunch (\$2.64 in operating costs and \$0.23 in administrative costs). Instead, using the simplified program sponsors simply earn the maximum reimbursement as a standard for all meals. Sponsors gain the double benefit of potentially higher reimbursements and less paperwork.



---

# The Cost of Low Participation

**L**ow participation in the Summer Nutrition programs has serious costs—low-income children lose access to the quality meals they need, youth programs lose an important source of support for their services, and states lose millions of dollars in federal nutrition funding.

As a way of estimating the total dollars being forfeited by the states in unclaimed Summer Nutrition funding, FRAC uses a benchmark for the ratio of participation that states should be reaching. Based on the performance of the most effective states, if states commit the necessary effort and resources, the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the regular school year is achievable. By calculating the additional number of children that would be served by each state if this goal were met, and multiplying it by the federal reimbursement rate for the 20 weekdays in July 2006 (not counting the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday), an estimate of the federal funding being lost by each state can be calculated.

In July 2006 if every state reached the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2005-2006 school year, an additional 3.6 million children would have been served each day, and the states would have collected an additional \$199 million in child nutrition funding. While the losses are higher in the states with larger populations (e.g. \$34.6 million in Texas, \$13.0 million in Florida and \$9.2 million in Georgia), 14 states each lost more than \$5 million in federal funding.

Of course, the Summer Nutrition programs are meant to be available throughout the entire summer recess—not just in the month of July. States are losing additional dollars due to low participation rates in June and August.

## Top Ten States in Lost Federal Funds (Amounts Foregone Because State Falls Short of Reaching 40 Children in the Summer Nutrition Programs per 100 Free & Reduced-Price Students in the Regular Year School Lunch Program)

State	Additional Children	Dollars Lost
Texas	621,316	\$34,576,231
Florida	233,750	\$13,008,198
Georgia	165,297	\$9,198,760
California	156,209	\$8,693,021
Illinois	149,346	\$8,311,116
Ohio	141,532	\$7,876,232
North Carolina	137,784	\$7,667,661
Michigan	123,455	\$6,870,255
Louisiana	117,931	\$6,562,846
New York	115,402	\$6,422,127

### The Power of Outreach

The Pocatello/Chubbuck Public School District, located in southeastern Idaho, began summer food program operations in 2002. Currently, the district serves 2,500 children per day, 48 percent of the area's low-income children.

According to the summer food staff, every possible outreach method is utilized to inform parents and children about the program. The district creates backpack flyers, sends out district emails, prints information on school lunch menus, and distributes flyers to day care centers, doctors' offices, and libraries. In addition, a press release is sent to local television stations, which report on the program during the nightly news.

---

# Participation Throughout the Summer

**H**unger pays no attention to the school calendar—children need access to healthy meals regardless of the month of the year. Unfortunately, few summer food sites stay open for the entire summer break. Due to funding limits, labor restrictions, or limited programming, most sites offering the Summer Nutrition programs operate for only part of the summer. Because of this, participation rates fluctuate throughout the summer, usually peaking in one month, with sometimes substantially lower participation during the other summer months.

In calculating the Summer Nutrition participation ratios used in this report, FRAC focuses on data from the month of July because it is the peak month for Summer Nutrition participation for most states, and it is also the month when the vast majority of schools are closed. As school schedules vary widely across the country, it is problematic to use the months of June or August for analysis—it is impossible to determine how many days of each month schools were actually closed for the summer recess. And because of the limits of the available USDA data, FRAC is unable in such instances to separate National School Lunch Program data to determine if meals were served as part of the summer program or as part of the regular school year.

While not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that some states, especially southern states that break for summer earlier in the year, have their peak participation in Summer Nutrition programs during the month of June. Using data for the number of meals served through the Summer Food Service Program, it is possible to see the month to month variability in a state's performance (see Table 5).

In all, 22 states served more SFSP lunches in June 2006 than in July 2006 (after adjusting for June having two more potential operating days). In some states—Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arizona—the number of SFSP meals served in June was at least double the number in July. In every state the number of meals served in August dropped substantially. While the number of meals served in July decreased by 1 percent from 2005 to 2006, the number of SFSP lunches served in June grew by 3 percent between 2005 and 2006.

## Reaching Rural Areas

The Salvation Army in Mankato serves a rural area in south central Minnesota. During the summer it operates three mobile feeding sites in addition to a site at its main headquarters. The program reaches 125 Minnesota children daily. The program's lunch service times are staggered so that the same two staff members can serve food at each site. The Salvation Army has also partnered with the Community Assistance for Refugees program to serve the Sudanese children in the area more effectively.

The staff members are proud of the program. They place a strong emphasis on their ability to reach children in their own neighborhoods, rather than limiting program access to those children that can get to the organization's headquarters.



---

## Recommendations

**A**fter years of declining, Summer Nutrition participation numbers finally stabilized in 2006, but they are still woefully inadequate. In order to improve participation in the Summer Nutrition programs, FRAC makes the following recommendations:

- The Simplified Summer Food Service Program should be expanded from its current 26 states to reach every state in the nation. This report and previous FRAC Summer Nutrition reports have highlighted the positive impact of simplification on program participation.
- Congress, states, and localities should ensure that adequate funding is available for summer learning and enrichment programs that serve low-income children. These programs provide the best platform to offer summer meals and allow low-income children opportunities to learn, stay safe, eat healthy food and be physically active.
- States should require school districts to offer summer meals if one or more of the district's schools has 50 percent or more of its students qualified for free or reduced-price school meals, or if the district is operating summer school; and states can provide funding to supplement the federal reimbursement and to support outreach and expansion activities.
- States should work to support the expansion of Summer Nutrition programs to cover the entire summer recess. Many sites are only open for a limited period, curtailing their ability to reach children in need. Programs should be designed so that they are a reliable source for meals throughout the summer.
- States should partner with schools, advocates, and public officials to conduct broad and timely outreach campaigns to recruit new sponsors and sites and to let parents and children know where and when programs are available in their community. Informing families about Summer Nutrition sites before the school year ends helps to ensure that children can gain access to the programs.
- Every school district should offer summer meals in all of its schools with 50 percent or more of

the students eligible for free or reduced-price meals, or work to ensure that the program is available in the community. The leadership and resources of a school district can make a substantial difference in Summer Nutrition participation.

- Sponsors should offer nutritious, appealing meals that include fresh fruits and vegetables, whole grains, and low fat milk. Combined with fun exercise, the Summer Nutrition programs are an important source for providing children with the healthy diet and supporting the physical activity they need.



---

## Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by FRAC. This report does not include Summer Nutrition programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

Due to rounding, totals in the tables may not add up to 100 percent.

### Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state's July average daily lunch attendance in the SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP lunches served by the total number of weekdays (excluding the Independence Day holiday) in July. The average daily lunch attendance numbers reported in this report are slightly different from the average daily participation numbers reported by USDA. FRAC's revised measure allows consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the school-year NSLP, as described below. The numbers of lunches served by state are from USDA.

Note that USDA does not report the number of sponsors or sites for June or August—it only reports these data for July of each year. USDA obtains the July numbers from the states and reports them as they receive them.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the data on sponsors, sites, and total number of lunches for June, July, and August that FRAC obtained from USDA.

### National School Lunch Program

Using data provided by USDA, FRAC calculated the school-year NSLP average daily low-income attendance for each state based on the number of free and reduced-price meals served from September through May.

FRAC used the July average daily attendance figures for the NSLP as provided by USDA for the summertime NSLP participation data in the report.

Note that USDA calculates average daily *participation* in the NSLP by dividing the average

daily lunch attendance by a factor of 0.927. This is to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC's *School Breakfast Scorecard* reports the NSLP average daily *participation* numbers—that is, including the 0.927 factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the summer food numbers, for which there is no analogous absenteeism factor, the *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation 2007* report does not include the absenteeism factor. As a result, the NSLP numbers in this report do not match the NSLP numbers in the *School Breakfast Scorecard 2006*.

### The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the regular school year. FRAC calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if each state reached a 40 to 100 ratio. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the reimbursement rate for 20 days (the number of weekdays in July 2006 not counting the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.



**TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2005 and July 2006 by State (Lunches in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and National School Lunch Program (NSLP)\*\* Combined)**

State	July 2005 Summer Nutrition				July 2006 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Summer Nutrition 2005 to 2006
	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 04-05 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 04-05 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 05-06 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 05-06 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	
Alabama	38,855	321,058	12.1	37	35,429	322,182	11.0	40	-8.8%
Alaska (2001)	1,818	30,134	6.0	50	2,222	31,659	7.0	49	22.3%
Arizona (2006)	46,186	361,416	12.8	35	48,829	370,777	13.2	33	5.7%
Arkansas (2001)	14,033	198,668	7.1	47	15,082	206,502	7.3	46	7.5%
California	639,909	1,972,325	32.4	4	638,042	1,985,627	32.1	3	-0.3%
Colorado (2005)	13,917	159,761	8.7	44	14,644	171,506	8.5	44	5.2%
Connecticut	27,751	127,728	21.7	14	33,575	128,869	26.1	8	21.0%
Delaware	8,848	35,541	24.9	9	9,021	37,311	24.2	12	2.0%
District of Columbia	27,575	35,892	76.8	1	28,724	33,334	86.2	1	4.2%
Florida	140,293	961,297	14.6	29	136,968	926,796	14.8	27	-2.4%
Georgia	96,003	644,843	14.9	27	109,806	687,757	16.0	25	14.4%
Hawaii	29,131	54,488	53.5	2	8,377	49,938	16.8	24	-71.2%
Idaho (2001)	15,066	77,759	19.4	19	17,001	79,494	21.4	15	12.8%
Illinois	116,879	644,524	18.1	21	108,451	644,492	16.8	22	-7.2%
Indiana (2001)	38,007	286,904	13.2	33	39,888	303,397	13.1	34	5.0%
Iowa (2001)	10,928	125,195	8.7	43	11,204	130,902	8.6	43	2.5%
Kansas (2001)	9,566	141,186	6.8	48	10,103	142,802	7.1	48	5.6%
Kentucky (2001)	43,496	276,968	15.7	24	47,657	283,545	16.8	23	9.6%
Louisiana (2005)	35,796	382,598	9.4	42	26,191	360,304	7.3	47	-26.8%
Maine (2006)	7,147	46,683	15.3	25	7,566	48,196	15.7	26	5.9%
Maryland	43,193	207,862	20.8	17	49,689	205,957	24.1	13	15.0%
Massachusetts	46,488	214,327	21.7	15	45,690	220,697	20.7	16	-1.7%
Michigan (2005)	49,781	431,050	11.5	39	53,761	443,038	12.1	37	8.0%
Minnesota	27,923	196,984	14.2	31	26,296	202,554	13.0	35	-5.8%
Mississippi (2005)	16,418	277,103	5.9	51	12,108	289,160	4.2	51	-26.3%
Missouri	75,611	297,879	25.4	8	51,492	300,782	17.1	20	-31.9%
Montana	6,417	36,197	17.7	22	5,515	37,556	14.7	28	-14.1%
Nebraska (2001)	7,111	87,685	8.1	46	7,947	89,838	8.8	42	11.8%
Nevada	31,349	100,723	31.1	5	32,063	107,108	29.9	4	2.3%
New Hampshire (2001)	4,087	28,500	14.3	30	4,225	29,325	14.4	29	3.4%
New Jersey	73,941	298,362	24.8	10	72,532	299,806	24.2	11	-1.9%
New Mexico	50,560	147,959	34.2	3	53,720	147,379	36.5	2	6.2%
New York	304,971	1,055,372	28.9	6	306,647	1,055,123	29.1	5	0.5%
North Carolina (2006)	62,631	503,094	12.4	36	72,441	525,561	13.8	30	15.7%
North Dakota (2001)	2,475	25,204	9.8	41	2,300	25,268	9.1	41	-7.1%
Ohio (2005)	52,093	476,080	10.9	40	56,184	494,288	11.4	39	7.9%
Oklahoma (2001)	14,664	240,634	6.1	49	12,352	248,008	5.0	50	-15.8%
Oregon (2005)	31,591	166,405	19.0	20	32,218	171,199	18.8	19	2.0%
Pennsylvania	126,460	474,004	26.7	7	126,445	477,953	26.5	7	0.0%
Rhode Island	10,884	44,913	24.2	12	11,874	44,564	26.6	6	9.1%
South Carolina	61,713	288,849	21.4	16	67,724	293,377	23.1	14	9.7%
South Dakota	7,897	39,880	19.8	18	7,769	40,561	19.2	18	-1.6%
Tennessee (2006)	46,358	356,637	13.0	34	43,741	369,003	11.9	38	-5.6%
Texas (2001)	152,638	1,879,963	8.1	45	166,199	1,968,786	8.4	45	8.9%
Utah	29,536	123,937	23.8	13	31,926	125,462	25.4	10	8.1%
Vermont	5,169	21,160	24.4	11	5,478	21,156	25.9	9	6.0%
Virginia	53,508	302,294	17.7	23	60,216	303,512	19.8	17	12.5%
Washington (2006)	37,639	269,795	14.0	32	34,106	273,843	12.5	36	-9.4%
West Virginia (2006)	16,140	107,095	15.1	26	17,875	105,979	16.9	21	10.8%
Wisconsin (2006)	30,725	208,918	14.7	28	28,448	215,324	13.2	32	-7.4%
Wyoming (2001)	2,474	21,256	11.6	38	2,844	21,123	13.5	31	15.0%
United States	2,843,649	15,815,093	18.0		2,850,604	16,098,682	17.7		0.2%
Simplified States	762,785	7,166,692	10.6		787,136	7,398,830	10.6		3.2%
Other States	2,080,864	8,648,401	24.1		2,063,468	8,699,852	23.7		-0.8%

\* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-years 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, respectively.

\*\* National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

**Bolded states joined the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program in summer 2001, 2005, or 2006, with the entry date indicated.**

**TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program and National School Lunch Program Participation from July 2005 to July 2006, by State**

State	Children in Summer Food Service Program			Children in National School Lunch Program		
	July 2005	July 2006	Change 2005 to 2006	July 2005	July 2006	Change 2005 to 2006
Alabama	29,751	26,533	-10.8%	9,104	8,895	-2.3%
<b>Alaska (2001)</b>	<b>1,184</b>	<b>1,115</b>	<b>-5.8%</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>1,107</b>	<b>74.8%</b>
<b>Arizona (2006)</b>	<b>3,303</b>	<b>7,837</b>	<b>137.3%</b>	<b>42,883</b>	<b>40,992</b>	<b>-4.4%</b>
<b>Arkansas (2001)</b>	<b>9,939</b>	<b>9,808</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>	<b>4,094</b>	<b>5,274</b>	<b>28.8%</b>
California	104,373	100,495	-3.7%	535,536	537,547	0.4%
<b>Colorado (2005)</b>	<b>7,355</b>	<b>8,011</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>6,562</b>	<b>6,633</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
Connecticut	8,216	8,576	4.4%	19,535	24,999	28.0%
Delaware	7,612	7,839	3.0%	1,236	1,182	-4.4%
District of Columbia	25,850	26,902	4.1%	1,724	1,822	5.7%
Florida	96,895	90,453	-6.6%	43,398	46,515	7.2%
Georgia	58,344	50,386	-13.6%	37,660	59,420	57.8%
Hawaii	4,598	3,043	-33.8%	24,532	5,334	-78.3%
<b>Idaho (2001)</b>	<b>13,707</b>	<b>15,503</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>1,358</b>	<b>1,498</b>	<b>10.3%</b>
Illinois	65,519	59,870	-8.6%	51,360	48,581	-5.4%
<b>Indiana (2001)</b>	<b>31,116</b>	<b>31,610</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>6,890</b>	<b>8,278</b>	<b>20.1%</b>
<b>Iowa (2001)</b>	<b>7,242</b>	<b>7,523</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>3,686</b>	<b>3,682</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>
<b>Kansas (2001)</b>	<b>8,151</b>	<b>8,420</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>1,415</b>	<b>1,683</b>	<b>18.9%</b>
<b>Kentucky (2001)</b>	<b>39,550</b>	<b>43,228</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>3,946</b>	<b>4,430</b>	<b>12.3%</b>
<b>Louisiana (2005)</b>	<b>32,790</b>	<b>23,319</b>	<b>-28.9%</b>	<b>3,006</b>	<b>2,872</b>	<b>-4.4%</b>
<b>Maine (2006)</b>	<b>6,593</b>	<b>6,887</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>22.7%</b>
Maryland	39,039	45,592	16.8%	4,154	4,096	-1.4%
Massachusetts	39,520	38,524	-2.5%	6,968	7,166	2.8%
<b>Michigan (2005)</b>	<b>38,267</b>	<b>34,626</b>	<b>-9.5%</b>	<b>11,514</b>	<b>19,135</b>	<b>66.2%</b>
Minnesota	23,037	20,461	-11.2%	4,885	5,835	19.4%
<b>Mississippi (2005)</b>	<b>14,812</b>	<b>10,515</b>	<b>-29.0%</b>	<b>1,606</b>	<b>1,593</b>	<b>-0.8%</b>
Missouri	32,205	30,208	-6.2%	43,406	21,285	-51.0%
Montana	5,830	4,935	-15.4%	587	579	-1.3%
<b>Nebraska (2001)</b>	<b>5,025</b>	<b>4,879</b>	<b>-2.9%</b>	<b>2,086</b>	<b>3,068</b>	<b>47.1%</b>
Nevada	3,564	3,249	-8.8%	27,784	28,814	3.7%
<b>New Hampshire (2001)</b>	<b>3,273</b>	<b>3,254</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>813</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
New Jersey	55,072	50,476	-8.3%	18,869	22,056	16.9%
New Mexico	34,467	31,168	-9.6%	16,093	22,552	40.1%
New York	252,551	251,041	-0.6%	52,420	55,606	6.1%
<b>North Carolina (2006)</b>	<b>32,038</b>	<b>32,869</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>30,593</b>	<b>39,572</b>	<b>29.3%</b>
<b>North Dakota (2001)</b>	<b>2,078</b>	<b>1,886</b>	<b>-9.2%</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>4.3%</b>
<b>Ohio (2005)</b>	<b>44,081</b>	<b>46,940</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>8,012</b>	<b>9,244</b>	<b>15.4%</b>
<b>Oklahoma (2001)</b>	<b>12,045</b>	<b>10,047</b>	<b>-16.6%</b>	<b>2,619</b>	<b>2,306</b>	<b>-12.0%</b>
<b>Oregon (2005)</b>	<b>23,787</b>	<b>25,278</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>7,803</b>	<b>6,939</b>	<b>-11.1%</b>
Pennsylvania	75,582	71,590	-5.3%	50,878	54,855	7.8%
Rhode Island	9,451	10,400	10.0%	1,433	1,474	2.9%
South Carolina	39,621	39,503	-0.3%	22,092	28,220	27.7%
South Dakota	3,229	2,844	-11.9%	4,668	4,925	5.5%
<b>Tennessee (2006)</b>	<b>19,808</b>	<b>28,034</b>	<b>41.5%</b>	<b>26,550</b>	<b>15,707</b>	<b>-40.8%</b>
<b>Texas (2001)</b>	<b>90,004</b>	<b>98,578</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>62,634</b>	<b>67,621</b>	<b>8.0%</b>
Utah	13,150	12,011	-8.7%	16,386	19,915	21.5%
Vermont	3,689	3,655	-0.9%	1,480	1,823	23.2%
Virginia	45,032	47,061	4.5%	8,476	13,155	55.2%
<b>Washington (2006)</b>	<b>21,068</b>	<b>26,709</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>16,571</b>	<b>7,397</b>	<b>-55.4%</b>
<b>West Virginia (2006)</b>	<b>13,510</b>	<b>14,757</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>2,630</b>	<b>3,117</b>	<b>18.5%</b>
<b>Wisconsin (2006)</b>	<b>26,912</b>	<b>24,766</b>	<b>-8.0%</b>	<b>3,814</b>	<b>3,683</b>	<b>-3.4%</b>
<b>Wyoming (2001)</b>	<b>1,730</b>	<b>1,991</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>14.7%</b>
<b>United States</b>	<b>1,585,568</b>	<b>1,565,205</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>	<b>1,258,080</b>	<b>1,285,399</b>	<b>2.2%</b>
<b>Simplified States</b>	<b>509,370</b>	<b>528,389</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>253,414</b>	<b>258,747</b>	<b>2.1%</b>
Other States	1,076,198	1,036,816	-3.7%	1,004,666	1,026,652	2.2%

Bolded states joined the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program in summer 2001, 2005 or 2006, with the entry date indicate

TABLE 3: Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Participation in July 2006 by State

State	Children in SFSP, July 2006	Children in 05-06 School-Year NSLP*	Children in SFSP per 100 in 05-06 School- Year NSLP*	Rank	Percent SFSP Contributes to Summer Nutrition Participation
Alabama	26,533	322,182	8.2	31	74.9%
<b>Alaska (2001)</b>	<b>1,115</b>	<b>31,659</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>50.2%</b>
<b>Arizona (2006)</b>	<b>7,837</b>	<b>370,777</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>16.1%</b>
<b>Arkansas (2001)</b>	<b>9,808</b>	<b>206,502</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>65.0%</b>
California	100,495	1,985,627	5.1	44	15.8%
<b>Colorado (2005)</b>	<b>8,011</b>	<b>171,506</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>54.7%</b>
Connecticut	8,576	128,869	6.7	37	25.5%
Delaware	7,839	37,311	21.0	6	86.9%
District of Columbia	26,902	33,334	80.7	1	93.7%
Florida	90,453	926,796	9.8	24	66.0%
Georgia	50,386	687,757	7.3	35	45.9%
Hawaii	3,043	49,938	6.1	40	36.3%
<b>Idaho (2001)</b>	<b>15,503</b>	<b>79,494</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>91.2%</b>
Illinois	59,870	644,492	9.3	29	55.2%
<b>Indiana (2001)</b>	<b>31,610</b>	<b>303,397</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>79.2%</b>
<b>Iowa (2001)</b>	<b>7,523</b>	<b>130,902</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>67.1%</b>
<b>Kansas (2001)</b>	<b>8,420</b>	<b>142,802</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>83.3%</b>
<b>Kentucky (2001)</b>	<b>43,228</b>	<b>283,545</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>90.7%</b>
<b>Louisiana (2005)</b>	<b>23,319</b>	<b>360,304</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>89.0%</b>
<b>Maine (2006)</b>	<b>6,887</b>	<b>48,196</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>91.0%</b>
Maryland	45,592	205,957	22.1	4	91.8%
Massachusetts	38,524	220,697	17.5	8	84.3%
<b>Michigan (2005)</b>	<b>34,626</b>	<b>443,038</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>64.4%</b>
Minnesota	20,461	202,554	10.1	22	77.8%
<b>Mississippi (2005)</b>	<b>10,515</b>	<b>289,160</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>86.8%</b>
Missouri	30,208	300,782	10.0	23	58.7%
Montana	4,935	37,556	13.1	18	89.5%
<b>Nebraska (2001)</b>	<b>4,879</b>	<b>89,838</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>61.4%</b>
Nevada	3,249	107,108	3.0	50	10.1%
<b>New Hampshire (2001)</b>	<b>3,254</b>	<b>29,325</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>77.0%</b>
New Jersey	50,476	299,806	16.8	10	69.6%
New Mexico	31,168	147,379	21.1	5	58.0%
New York	251,041	1,055,123	23.8	2	81.9%
<b>North Carolina (2006)</b>	<b>32,869</b>	<b>525,561</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>45.4%</b>
<b>North Dakota (2001)</b>	<b>1,886</b>	<b>25,268</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>82.0%</b>
<b>Ohio (2005)</b>	<b>46,940</b>	<b>494,288</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>83.5%</b>
<b>Oklahoma (2001)</b>	<b>10,047</b>	<b>248,008</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>81.3%</b>
<b>Oregon (2005)</b>	<b>25,278</b>	<b>171,199</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>78.5%</b>
Pennsylvania	71,590	477,953	15.0	13	56.6%
Rhode Island	10,400	44,564	23.3	3	87.6%
South Carolina	39,503	293,377	13.5	17	58.3%
South Dakota	2,844	40,561	7.0	36	36.6%
<b>Tennessee (2006)</b>	<b>28,034</b>	<b>369,003</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>64.1%</b>
<b>Texas (2001)</b>	<b>98,578</b>	<b>1,968,786</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>59.3%</b>
Utah	12,011	125,462	9.6	26	37.6%
Vermont	3,655	21,156	17.3	9	66.7%
Virginia	47,061	303,512	15.5	11	78.2%
<b>Washington (2006)</b>	<b>26,709</b>	<b>273,843</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>78.3%</b>
<b>West Virginia (2006)</b>	<b>14,757</b>	<b>105,979</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>82.6%</b>
<b>Wisconsin (2006)</b>	<b>24,766</b>	<b>215,324</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>87.1%</b>
<b>Wyoming (2001)</b>	<b>1,991</b>	<b>21,123</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>70.0%</b>
<b>United States</b>	<b>1,565,205</b>	<b>16,098,682</b>	<b>9.7</b>		<b>54.9%</b>
<b>Simplified States</b>	<b>528,389</b>	<b>7,398,830</b>	<b>7.1</b>		<b>67.1%</b>
<b>Other States</b>	<b>1,036,816</b>	<b>8,699,852</b>	<b>11.9</b>		<b>50.2%</b>

\* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-year 2005-2006.

**Bolded states joined the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program in summer 2001, 2005, or 2006, with the entry date indicated.**

**TABLE 4: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2005 to July 2006, by State**

State	Number of Sponsors			Number of Sites		
	July 2005	July 2006	Percent Change	July 2005	July 2006	Percent Change
Alabama	54	47	-13.0%	654	635	-2.9%
<b>Alaska (2001)</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>-12.5%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>-34.7%</b>
Arizona (2006)	18	33	83.3%	93	150	61.3%
<b>Arkansas (2001)</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>-2.7%</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>-15.0%</b>
California	186	162	-12.9%	1,456	1,313	-9.8%
<b>Colorado (2005)</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>-13.7%</b>
Connecticut	21	23	9.5%	124	140	12.9%
Delaware	18	17	-5.6%	222	229	3.2%
District of Columbia	25	19	-24.0%	301	376	24.9%
Florida	95	83	-12.6%	2,123	2,065	-2.7%
Georgia	106	85	-19.8%	1,400	1,316	-6.0%
Hawaii	17	19	11.8%	101	102	1.0%
<b>Idaho (2001)</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>24.4%</b>
Illinois	114	114	0.0%	1,266	1,283	1.3%
<b>Indiana (2001)</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>21.9%</b>
<b>Iowa (2001)</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
Kansas (2001)	47	52	10.6%	183	188	2.7%
<b>Kentucky (2001)</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>1,747</b>	<b>2,232</b>	<b>27.8%</b>
Louisiana (2005)	70	65	-7.1%	640	340	-46.9%
<b>Maine (2006)</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>20.4%</b>
Maryland	39	44	12.8%	872	924	6.0%
Massachusetts	86	84	-2.3%	719	712	-1.0%
<b>Michigan (2005)</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
Minnesota	34	44	29.4%	327	316	-3.4%
<b>Mississippi (2005)</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>-6.0%</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>-19.5%</b>
Missouri	98	68	-30.6%	545	462	-15.2%
Montana	50	49	-2.0%	147	142	-3.4%
<b>Nebraska (2001)</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>-8.8%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>-6.7%</b>
Nevada	27	20	-25.9%	72	72	0.0%
<b>New Hampshire (2001)</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>-7.1%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>-13.3%</b>
New Jersey	96	90	-6.3%	1,063	1,076	1.2%
New Mexico	48	48	0.0%	610	606	-0.7%
New York	291	273	-6.2%	2,472	2,472	0.0%
<b>North Carolina (2006)</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>-7.9%</b>
<b>North Dakota (2001)</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6.3%</b>
<b>Ohio (2005)</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>1,107</b>	<b>1,198</b>	<b>8.2%</b>
<b>Oklahoma (2001)</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>-2.1%</b>
<b>Oregon (2005)</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>24.3%</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>18.1%</b>
Pennsylvania	222	222	0.0%	2,218	1,944	-12.4%
Rhode Island	12	11	-8.3%	159	170	6.9%
South Carolina	53	48	-9.4%	966	1,002	3.7%
South Dakota	22	22	0.0%	43	43	0.0%
<b>Tennessee (2006)</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>-13.7%</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>762</b>	<b>21.5%</b>
<b>Texas (2001)</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>-4.7%</b>	<b>1,555</b>	<b>1,468</b>	<b>-5.6%</b>
Utah	15	13	-13.3%	116	104	-10.3%
Vermont	34	32	-5.9%	94	94	0.0%
Virginia	114	125	9.6%	1,032	1,130	9.5%
<b>Washington (2006)</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>57.1%</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
<b>West Virginia (2006)</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>9.0%</b>
<b>Wisconsin (2006)</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>-2.3%</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
<b>Wyoming (2001)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>28.6%</b>
<b>United States</b>	<b>3,657</b>	<b>3,647</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>	<b>30,309</b>	<b>30,730</b>	<b>1.4%</b>

Bolded states joined the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program in summer 2001, 2005, or 2006 with the entry date indicated.

TABLE 5: Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches\* Served in June, July, and August 2005 and 2006, by State

State	June 2005 SFSP Lunches	June 2006 SFSP Lunches	% Change	July 2005 SFSP Lunches	July 2006 SFSP Lunches	% Change	August 2005 SFSP Lunches	August 2006 SFSP Lunches	% Change
Alabama	878,844	797,323	-9%	595,013	530,667	-11%	15,743	15,238	-3%
<b>Alaska (2001)</b>	<b>17,509</b>	<b>23,902</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>23,684</b>	<b>22,309</b>	<b>-6%</b>	<b>9,117</b>	<b>6,941</b>	<b>-24%</b>
<b>Arizona (2006)</b>	<b>249,662</b>	<b>452,164</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>66,059</b>	<b>156,743</b>	<b>137%</b>	<b>3,664</b>	<b>9,441</b>	<b>158%</b>
<b>Arkansas (2001)</b>	<b>300,917</b>	<b>287,214</b>	<b>-5%</b>	<b>198,775</b>	<b>196,164</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>17,823</b>	<b>23,562</b>	<b>32%</b>
California	614,970	524,061	-15%	2,087,466	2,009,902	-4%	800,396	768,195	-4%
<b>Colorado (2005)</b>	<b>216,093</b>	<b>267,286</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>147,098</b>	<b>160,223</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>7,997</b>	<b>15,096</b>	<b>89%</b>
Connecticut	N/A	0	N/A	164,320	171,522	4%	46,467	51,676	11%
Delaware	70,760	77,341	9%	152,236	156,786	3%	89,250	101,655	14%
District of Columbia	792	105,235	13187%	517,007	538,032	4%	181,697	198,649	9%
Florida	2,349,116	2,309,764	-2%	1,937,900	1,809,058	-7%	1,697	14,942	780%
Georgia	1,701,452	1,490,329	-12%	1,166,875	1,007,726	-14%	94,765	80,781	-15%
Hawaii	100,011	75,606	-24%	91,964	60,869	-34%	3,177	0	-100%
<b>Idaho (2001)</b>	<b>296,368</b>	<b>347,988</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>274,148</b>	<b>310,056</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>136,025</b>	<b>157,291</b>	<b>16%</b>
Illinois	587,862	613,082	4%	1,310,370	1,197,743	-9%	632,829	524,224	-17%
<b>Indiana (2001)</b>	<b>431,095</b>	<b>514,571</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>622,321</b>	<b>632,207</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>128,730</b>	<b>127,826</b>	<b>-1%</b>
<b>Iowa (2001)</b>	<b>132,452</b>	<b>171,943</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>144,849</b>	<b>150,450</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>27,604</b>	<b>27,653</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Kansas (2001)</b>	<b>253,743</b>	<b>306,956</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>163,020</b>	<b>168,404</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>19,111</b>	<b>4,211</b>	<b>-78%</b>
<b>Kentucky (2001)</b>	<b>1,050,475</b>	<b>1,181,328</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>791,005</b>	<b>864,552</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>63,031</b>	<b>53,290</b>	<b>-15%</b>
<b>Louisiana (2005)</b>	<b>1,390,060</b>	<b>1,054,620</b>	<b>-24%</b>	<b>655,807</b>	<b>466,370</b>	<b>-29%</b>	<b>87,230</b>	<b>3,764</b>	<b>-96%</b>
<b>Maine (2006)</b>	<b>9,687</b>	<b>9,937</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>131,864</b>	<b>137,736</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>40,780</b>	<b>38,550</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Maryland	111,334	209,155	88%	780,786	911,849	17%	169,331	192,763	14%
Massachusetts	9,995	19,808	98%	790,400	770,488	-3%	477,237	440,394	-8%
<b>Michigan (2005)</b>	<b>177,138</b>	<b>271,131</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>765,348</b>	<b>692,518</b>	<b>-10%</b>	<b>204,523</b>	<b>269,833</b>	<b>32%</b>
Minnesota	226,545	219,711	-3%	460,747	409,224	-11%	70,033	81,154	16%
<b>Mississippi (2005)</b>	<b>923,249</b>	<b>893,235</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>296,236</b>	<b>210,296</b>	<b>-29%</b>	<b>12,631</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>-96%</b>
Missouri	1,021,911	1,239,795	21%	644,103	604,150	-6%	320,414	119,000	-63%
Montana	95,960	94,832	-1%	116,607	98,704	-15%	26,318	21,253	-19%
<b>Nebraska (2001)</b>	<b>137,696</b>	<b>148,597</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>100,491</b>	<b>97,575</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>19,985</b>	<b>18,934</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Nevada	47,178	51,217	9%	71,286	64,988	-9%	47,013	45,719	-3%
<b>New Hampshire (2001)</b>	<b>13,717</b>	<b>8,871</b>	<b>-35%</b>	<b>65,468</b>	<b>65,082</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>31,412</b>	<b>34,700</b>	<b>10%</b>
New Jersey	8,234	8,277	1%	1,101,448	1,009,511	-8%	518,738	519,883	0%
New Mexico	853,426	788,818	-8%	689,337	623,356	-10%	11,920	10,528	-12%
New York	118,034	136,392	16%	5,051,022	5,020,812	-1%	3,569,058	3,421,328	-4%
<b>North Carolina (2006)</b>	<b>585,029</b>	<b>304,492</b>	<b>-48%</b>	<b>640,755</b>	<b>657,381</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>173,695</b>	<b>221,834</b>	<b>28%</b>
<b>North Dakota (2001)</b>	<b>56,716</b>	<b>60,011</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>41,567</b>	<b>37,723</b>	<b>-9%</b>	<b>15,160</b>	<b>13,270</b>	<b>-12%</b>
<b>Ohio (2005)</b>	<b>619,952</b>	<b>783,541</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>881,627</b>	<b>938,794</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>262,466</b>	<b>281,324</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Oklahoma (2001)</b>	<b>422,291</b>	<b>521,655</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>240,894</b>	<b>200,934</b>	<b>-17%</b>	<b>7,948</b>	<b>13,336</b>	<b>68%</b>
<b>Oregon (2005)</b>	<b>96,613</b>	<b>126,113</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>475,741</b>	<b>505,567</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>205,208</b>	<b>237,192</b>	<b>16%</b>
Pennsylvania	562,747	484,535	-14%	1,511,631	1,431,799	-5%	767,907	805,636	5%
Rhode Island	N/A	48,771	N/A	189,027	207,995	10%	108,469	119,473	10%
South Carolina	1,013,846	1,039,788	3%	792,412	790,064	0%	59,953	108,874	82%
South Dakota	87,537	60,298	-31%	64,580	56,881	-12%	35,731	28,691	-20%
<b>Tennessee (2006)</b>	<b>551,737</b>	<b>898,684</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>396,165</b>	<b>560,674</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>31,879</b>	<b>19,080</b>	<b>-40%</b>
<b>Texas (2001)</b>	<b>5,865,097</b>	<b>5,708,396</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>1,800,083</b>	<b>1,971,561</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>131,120</b>	<b>93,787</b>	<b>-28%</b>
Utah	287,096	337,277	17%	263,003	240,218	-9%	108,018	75,699	-30%
Vermont	1,869	1,827	-2%	73,781	73,098	-1%	9,135	8,882	-3%
Virginia	159,722	177,289	11%	900,640	941,221	5%	373,786	437,588	17%
<b>Washington (2006)</b>	<b>99,481</b>	<b>180,906</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>421,367</b>	<b>534,170</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>203,218</b>	<b>231,250</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>West Virginia (2006)</b>	<b>96,676</b>	<b>96,615</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>270,190</b>	<b>295,149</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>64,047</b>	<b>54,825</b>	<b>-14%</b>
<b>Wisconsin (2006)</b>	<b>183,292</b>	<b>205,649</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>538,232</b>	<b>495,315</b>	<b>-8%</b>	<b>158,375</b>	<b>184,453</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Wyoming (2001)</b>	<b>29,523</b>	<b>37,234</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>34,609</b>	<b>39,820</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>14,391</b>	<b>19,889</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>United States</b>	<b>25,115,509</b>	<b>25,773,570</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>31,711,364</b>	<b>31,304,436</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>10,616,252</b>	<b>10,354,043</b>	<b>-2%</b>

\* Some states may serve lunches for a few days in June or August, but do not have data in those months. This is because sponsors are allowed, if they do not serve for more than 10 days in those months, to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork.

**Bolded states joined the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program in summer 2001, 2005, or 2006, with the entry date indicated.**

**TABLE 6: Estimated Number of Children Participating and Additional Federal Payments in July 2006 Summer Nutrition, if States Served 40 Children per 100 Served in School Year National School Lunch Program**

State	Children in Summer Nutrition (School Lunch* & Summer Food Combined), July 2006	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 05-06 School-Year NSLP**	Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP**	Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP**	Additional Federal Reimbursement if State Reached in July a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP***
Alabama	35,429	11.0	128,873	93,444	\$5,200,179
<b>Alaska (2001)</b>	<b>2,222</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>12,663</b>	<b>10,441</b>	<b>\$581,040</b>
<b>Arizona (2006)</b>	<b>48,829</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>148,311</b>	<b>99,482</b>	<b>\$5,536,152</b>
<b>Arkansas (2001)</b>	<b>15,082</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>82,601</b>	<b>67,519</b>	<b>\$3,757,414</b>
California	638,042	32.1	794,251	156,209	\$8,693,021
<b>Colorado (2005)</b>	<b>14,644</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>68,603</b>	<b>53,959</b>	<b>\$3,002,795</b>
Connecticut	33,575	26.1	51,548	17,972	\$1,000,160
Delaware	9,021	24.2	14,924	5,904	\$328,533
District of Columbia	28,724	86.2	--	--	--
Florida	136,968	14.8	370,718	233,750	\$13,008,198
Georgia	109,806	16.0	275,103	165,297	\$9,198,760
Hawaii	8,377	16.8	19,975	11,598	\$645,430
<b>Idaho (2001)</b>	<b>17,001</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>31,798</b>	<b>14,797</b>	<b>\$823,461</b>
Illinois	108,451	16.8	257,797	149,346	\$8,311,116
<b>Indiana (2001)</b>	<b>39,888</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>121,359</b>	<b>81,471</b>	<b>\$4,533,850</b>
<b>Iowa (2001)</b>	<b>11,204</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>52,361</b>	<b>41,156</b>	<b>\$2,290,359</b>
<b>Kansas (2001)</b>	<b>10,103</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>57,121</b>	<b>47,018</b>	<b>\$2,616,559</b>
<b>Kentucky (2001)</b>	<b>47,657</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>113,418</b>	<b>65,761</b>	<b>\$3,659,591</b>
<b>Louisiana (2005)</b>	<b>26,191</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>144,122</b>	<b>117,931</b>	<b>\$6,562,846</b>
<b>Maine (2006)</b>	<b>7,566</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>19,278</b>	<b>11,712</b>	<b>\$651,775</b>
Maryland	49,689	24.1	82,383	32,694	\$1,819,409
Massachusetts	45,690	20.7	88,279	42,589	\$2,370,069
<b>Michigan (2005)</b>	<b>53,761</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>177,215</b>	<b>123,455</b>	<b>\$6,870,255</b>
Minnesota	26,296	13.0	81,022	54,726	\$3,045,479
<b>Mississippi (2005)</b>	<b>12,108</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>115,664</b>	<b>103,556</b>	<b>\$5,762,894</b>
Missouri	51,492	17.1	120,313	68,820	\$3,829,852
Montana	5,515	14.7	15,022	9,508	\$529,108
<b>Nebraska (2001)</b>	<b>7,947</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>35,935</b>	<b>27,988</b>	<b>\$1,557,535</b>
Nevada	32,063	29.9	42,843	10,780	\$599,926
<b>New Hampshire (2001)</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>11,730</b>	<b>7,505</b>	<b>\$417,656</b>
New Jersey	72,532	24.2	119,923	47,391	\$2,637,300
New Mexico	53,720	36.5	58,952	5,232	\$291,137
New York	306,647	29.1	422,049	115,402	\$6,422,127
<b>North Carolina (2006)</b>	<b>72,441</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>210,225</b>	<b>137,784</b>	<b>\$7,667,661</b>
<b>North Dakota (2001)</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>10,107</b>	<b>7,807</b>	<b>\$434,455</b>
<b>Ohio (2005)</b>	<b>56,184</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>197,715</b>	<b>141,532</b>	<b>\$7,876,232</b>
<b>Oklahoma (2001)</b>	<b>12,352</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>99,203</b>	<b>86,851</b>	<b>\$4,833,258</b>
<b>Oregon (2005)</b>	<b>32,218</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>68,480</b>	<b>36,262</b>	<b>\$2,017,969</b>
Pennsylvania	126,445	26.5	191,181	64,736	\$3,602,561
Rhode Island	11,874	26.6	17,826	5,952	\$331,233
South Carolina	67,724	23.1	117,351	49,627	\$2,761,747
South Dakota	7,769	19.2	16,225	8,455	\$470,534
<b>Tennessee (2006)</b>	<b>43,741</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>147,601</b>	<b>103,860</b>	<b>\$5,779,824</b>
<b>Texas (2001)</b>	<b>166,199</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>787,515</b>	<b>621,316</b>	<b>\$34,576,231</b>
Utah	31,926	25.4	50,185	18,258	\$1,016,085
Vermont	5,478	25.9	8,462	2,984	\$166,068
Virginia	60,216	19.8	121,405	61,189	\$3,405,161
<b>Washington (2006)</b>	<b>34,106</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>109,537</b>	<b>75,431</b>	<b>\$4,197,758</b>
<b>West Virginia (2006)</b>	<b>17,875</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>42,392</b>	<b>24,517</b>	<b>\$1,364,354</b>
<b>Wisconsin (2006)</b>	<b>28,448</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>86,130</b>	<b>57,681</b>	<b>\$3,209,970</b>
<b>Wyoming (2001)</b>	<b>2,844</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>8,449</b>	<b>5,605</b>	<b>\$311,946</b>
<b>United States</b>	<b>2,850,604</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>6,426,139</b>	<b>3,575,536</b>	<b>\$198,978,554</b>

\* National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

\*\* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-year 2005-2006.

\*\*\* This estimate is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each day only for lunch (not breakfast or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a SFSP lunch (\$2.7825 per lunch). It also assumes that all participants are served for the full 20 weekdays in July 2006 (not counting the July 4th holiday).

**Bolded states joined the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program in summer 2001, 2005, or 2006, with the entry date indicated.**

**Table 7: Change in Summer Nutrition Participation by State's Entry into the Simplified Summer Food Program**

State	Percent Change July 2000 to July 2006
Alaska	55.7%
Arkansas	18.0%
Idaho	178.2%
Indiana	98.0%
Iowa	43.2%
Kansas	56.6%
Kentucky	91.8%
Nebraska	58.6%
New Hampshire	25.4%
North Dakota	-9.4%
Oklahoma	-12.5%
Texas	40.7%
Wyoming	157.3%
<b>Original Simplified States</b>	<b>51.5%</b>
Alabama	-24.2%
California	-16.5%
Connecticut	-13.4%
Delaware	-13.3%
District of Columbia	7.0%
Florida	-39.4%
Georgia	17.6%
Hawaii	-45.8%
Illinois	-35.5%
Maryland	10.9%
Massachusetts	-9.3%
Minnesota	-10.1%
Missouri	21.1%
Montana	19.7%
Nevada	14.3%
New Jersey	9.9%
New Mexico	1.0%
New York	-26.3%
Pennsylvania	11.4%
Rhode Island	-17.2%
South Carolina	-3.4%
South Dakota	8.6%
Utah	38.0%
Vermont	30.1%
Virginia	30.7%
<b>Non-Simplified States</b>	<b>-16.5%</b>

State	Percent Change July 2004 to July 2006
Colorado	11.7%
Louisiana	-40.8%
Michigan	-2.9%
Mississippi	-36.5%
Ohio	9.6%
Oregon	4.5%
<b>Wave 2 Simplified States</b>	<b>-8.8%</b>
Wave 2 (Excluding LA and MS)*	4.1%

\*The six states which entered the Simplified Summer Food Program in 2005 posted an 8.8 percent decrease in Summer Nutrition participation between July 2004 and July 2006. But the two states that were most widely affected by the devastation of Hurricane Katrina in 2005 are included in this group. If Louisiana and Mississippi are removed from the analysis, the four remaining states show an increase in Summer Nutrition participation of 4.1 percent between July 2004 and July 2006.

State	Percent Change July 2005 to July 2006
Arizona	5.7%
Maine	5.9%
North Carolina	15.7%
Tennessee	-5.6%
Washington	-9.4%
West Virginia	10.8%
Wisconsin	-7.4%
<b>Wave 3 Simplified States</b>	<b>2.5%</b>

Change in Summer Nutrition is calculated by comparing 2006 participation figures to the year prior to the state joining the Simplified Summer Food Program.

# Summer Nutrition Legislation by State

*Types of state summer nutrition legislation included in this table:*

**State Mandate (M)** – State law requiring that all or certain schools offer the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)  
**State Funding (\$)** – State funds for a purpose related to the SFSP  
**Reporting Requirement (R)** – State law that state, schools or districts convene advisory group, and/or report participation or reasons for nonparticipation in the SFSP

STATE		DETAILS
Alabama		NONE
Alaska		NONE
Arizona		NONE
Arkansas		NONE
California	\$	The state allocates \$5.4 million (as of press time) to school districts and county offices of education to start or expand the School Breakfast and Summer Food Service Program. School district and county offices may apply for a one-time start-up or expansion grant for both school and non-school sites. The maximum amount per grant is \$15,000 per site. CAL. ED. CODE § 49550.3.
	\$	During the 2006 summer, the state allocated \$0.15 in additional reimbursement for each free and reduced price meal served by school through NSLP, including those served under the Seamless Summer Option. The supplemental reimbursement was raised and adjusted for inflation effective July 1, 2006. CAL Ed Code 49430.5. Changes in statute made by the passage of AB 1802, the 2006-2007 Budget Trailer bill, impacted this additional reimbursement and raised the statutory requirement to \$.21 (as of press time).
	M	Existing law requires <u>all</u> schools to offer meals to needy students during summer school. Recent legislation limited the allowable exemptions, which brought more schools under the mandate. CAL Ed Code 49548
Colorado		NONE
Connecticut		NONE
Delaware		NONE
District of Columbia	\$	The district allocated \$750,000 to enhance marketing and outreach efforts to increase participation in SFSP, to extend programs through late August 2006 and to purchase a vehicle to be used for monitoring and outreach purposes.
Florida	M	Beginning in 2006, each school district is required to sponsor a summer nutrition program that operates at least one site within 5 miles of at least one elementary school at which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible, and at least one site within 10 miles of every other elementary school in which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible. Districts may only seek an exemption from the mandate by voting on the issue at a school board meeting that provides the opportunity for public comment. The school board must reconsider each year. FLA. STAT. Ch 1006.0606.
Georgia		NONE
Hawaii		NONE
Idaho		NONE
Illinois		NONE
Indiana		NONE
Iowa		NONE
Kansas		NONE
Kentucky		NONE

<b>Louisiana</b>		NONE
<b>Maine</b>		NONE
<b>Maryland</b>	M	If the public school system operates summer school, it must provide a meal program (can be breakfast, lunch, or breakfast and lunch). MD. CODE ANN., EDUC. § 7-603,
<b>Massachusetts</b>	\$	In total for 2006, \$2.4 million total was allocated for breakfast and summer outreach, start up and expansion grants, and reimbursements. Of that, \$300,000 is allocated for SFSP outreach. Funding is expected to remain the same for 2007.
<b>Michigan</b>		NONE
<b>Minnesota</b>	\$	State contributes \$150,000 in additional funds for education department-approved SFSP sponsors to supplement federal reimbursement rates: up to 4 cents per breakfast, 14 cents per lunch or supper, and 10 cents per snack. MINN. STAT. § 124D.119.
<b>Mississippi</b>		NONE
<b>Missouri</b>	M	SFSP required in school districts where 50 percent or more of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and in service institutions where more than 40 children congregate; districts can request a waiver. MO. REV. STAT. §191.810.
<b>Montana</b>		NONE
<b>Nebraska</b>		NONE
<b>Nevada</b>		NONE
<b>New Hampshire</b>		NONE
<b>New Jersey</b>		NONE
<b>New Mexico</b>		NONE
<b>New York</b>	\$	State allocates \$3.3 million to SFSP sponsors to supplement all summer breakfasts, lunches, suppers and snacks claimed for federal funds. This allocation also provides a per meal rate for sponsors serving and claiming a fourth meal supplement.
<b>North Carolina</b>		NONE
<b>North Dakota</b>		NONE
<b>Ohio</b>	M	The governing body for each school that offers student intervention programs during the summer months shall establish an extension of School Breakfast Program, and extension of National School Lunch Program or participate in the Summer Food Service Program. If the governing board of a community school determines that, for financial reasons, it cannot comply, it shall communicate its decision to the parents of its students. OHIO REV.CODE ANN. §3314.18
	\$	State allocates \$900,000 per fiscal year to the Children's Hunger Alliance to increase participation in the child nutrition programs, including the Summer Nutrition Programs.
<b>Oklahoma</b>		NONE
<b>Oregon</b>	\$	State appropriates \$150,000 for reimbursements for summer lunches. The Department of Education supplements the federal reimbursement with 5 cents per lunch served during the summer as part of the SFSP or the NSLP. OR STAT 327.527.
<b>Pennsylvania</b>		NONE
<b>Rhode Island</b>		NONE
<b>South Carolina</b>		NONE
<b>South Dakota</b>		NONE
<b>Tennessee</b>		NONE
<b>Texas</b>	\$	State allocated \$756,000 for 2006 and \$712,500 for 2007 to supplement federal meal reimbursement and provide funding for outreach. However, funding was not available for 2007 and is unlikely to be available in the future. Supplement reimbursement is 4 cents for breakfast, 8 cents for lunch and supper, and 2 cents for snacks.
	M	School districts are required to offer SFSP where more than 60 percent of children are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. TEX. HUM. RES. CODE § 33.024 (1993).
		Oversight of the Summer Nutrition Programs were transferred the Texas Department of Agriculture in 2007.
<b>Utah</b>		NONE

---

<b>Vermont</b>	\$	The state allocated \$51,387.00 for SFSP in 2006. Sponsors can use the funds either as reimbursement supplements or for activities and/or transportation in order to promote the program. The Department of Education encourages sponsors to use the funds for activities and/or transportation. The state also allocated \$48,550 to Vermont Campaign to End Childhood Hunger for budget year 2006 – 2007.
<b>Virginia</b>		NONE
<b>Washington</b>	M	If the public school district operates a summer program and fifty percent or more of the students enrolled in the school qualify for free or reduced-price meals, the school district must implement a summer food service program in each of the operating public schools. Sites providing the meals should be open to all children in the area unless a compelling case can be made to limit access to the program. Schools may be exempt from implementing the Summer Food Service Program if they can demonstrate the availability of an adequate alternative summer feeding program. WA. LEGIS 287 (2005)
	\$	State allocates \$100,000 to support SFSP sponsors that participated during the previous summer. The funding is distributed based upon the proportion of the meals each sponsor served during the previous summer.
	\$	For the summer of 2006, state advanced \$23,200 for start up and expansion grants. For 2007, the state allocated \$24,275 for advances.
<b>West Virginia</b>		NONE
<b>Wisconsin</b>		NONE
<b>Wyoming</b>		NONE